

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPAREMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Vitres of AMMOST CHEEF OF EXPERITE MAJORIAN EMANGE WASHINGTON OF THE OWN OF THE WASHINGTON OF THE WASHINGTON OF THE OWN OF THE WASHINGTON OF T

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKETNO | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 09 828,599 | 04 05 2001 | Frances H. Arnold | 9373 1H222US1 | 5688 | |
| 7278 | 590 02 05 2003 | | | | |
| DARBY & DARBY P.C. | | | EXAMINER | | |
| P. O. BOX 525 NEW YORK, 1 | 7 NY 10150-5257 | | SAUCIER, SANDRA E | | |
| | | | ART UNII | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1651 | 6 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 02-05-2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/828,599

Arnold et al.

Examiner

Sandra Saucier

Art Unit **1651**



| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears o | n the cover she | eet with | the correspondence address | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Period f | or Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the | | | | | | | |
| - If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re | date of this communication. seriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the seriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply an to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of thi patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | d will expire SIX (6) application to becor | MONTHS: ne ABAND | from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) 🗌 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | · | | | |
| 2a) 🗌 | This action is FINAL . 2b) X This action | on is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) 🗌 | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| | tion of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) 🗶 | Claim(s) <u>1-62</u> | | | is/are pending in the application. | | | |
| | a) Of the above, claim(s) | | | | | | |
| 5) 🗔 | Claim(s) | | | | | | |
| 6) 🗌 | Claim(s) | | | | | | |
| 7) 🗆 | Claim(s) | | | | | | |
| 8) X | Claims <u>1-62</u> | | | | | | |
| | ition Papers | | | | | | |
| • • • | The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) | The second as the second to but the Everyines | | | | | | |
| - | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) | is all account by disapproved by the Everyiner | | | | | | |
| | If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12) | 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | |
| a) All b) Some* c) None of: | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. | | | | | | |
| * ~ | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Burea ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the | iu (PCT Rule T | 7.2(a) | • | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic The translation of the foreign language provisional | | | | | | |
| a) ∟ 15) 🗔 | | | | | | | |
| Attachm | | , | _ | | | | |
| | otice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) [] Interview Su | ummary (P° | TO-413) Paper No(s) | | | |
| 2) [N | 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | | | |
| 3) [In | formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | 6) Other: | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/828599 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-62 are pending and subject to restriction.

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-31, drawn to a first method of detecting an oxidation enzyme comprising contacting a test enzyme with an oxygen donor, classified in class 435, subclasses 18, 25-28 and others depending on enzyme.
- II. Claims 32-56, drawn to a second method of detecting an oxidation enzyme comprising contacting a test enzyme with a substrate, classified in class 435, subclasses 18, 25-28 and others depending on enzyme.
- III. Claims 57-62, drawn to a third method of detecting an oxidation enzyme comprising contacting a test enzyme with a substrate to promote formation of a phenol ether, classified in class 435, subclasses 18, 25-28 and others depending on enzyme.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The processes are distinct from one another because they recite different and distinct steps.

For example, the method of Group I requires an oxygen donor, which is not required by the method of Group II. The method of Group III requires that a phenol ether be generated, while this product is not required by the methods of Groups I and II.

Election of Species

If Groups I or II are elected for examination, a further election of species is required.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the species of claims 3, 18, 34.

Application/Control Number: 09/828599 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 16, 32 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The several inventions listed above are independent and distinct from one another as they require independent searches, particularly with regard to the literature searches. Clearly, a reference which would anticipate one of the above groups would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious any of the others.

An undue burden would ensue from the examination of multiple methods which have distinct steps and end points. Burden lies not only in the search of US Patents, but in the search for literature and foreign patents and examination of the claim language and specification for compliance with the statutes concerning new matter, distinctness and scope of enablement.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1651

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1651. The supervisor for 1651 is M. Wityshyn, (703) 308-4743. The normal work schedule for Examiner Saucier is 8:30AM to 5:00 PM Monday and Tuesday and 8:30 to noon on Wednesday.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Saucier whose telephone number is (703) 308–1084. Status inquiries must be directed to the Customer Service Desk at (703) 308–0197 or (703)–308–0198. The number of the Fax Center for the faxing of papers is (703) 308–2742 or (703) 305–3592.

Sandra Saucier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651

February 4, 2003